RESOLVED, That the American Bar Association urges governments to promote the human right to adequate housing for all through increased funding, development and implementation of affordable housing strategies and to prevent infringement of that right.
One of the four goals listed alongside the ABA’s mission statement is to Advance the Rule of Law, which includes objectives to hold governments accountable and work for just laws and human rights.\textsuperscript{1} The Universal Declaration of Human Rights lists the right to adequate housing as a necessary component of the right to a standard of living that supports one’s health and well-being.\textsuperscript{2}

Coming out of the Depression, and heading into World War II, President Franklin Roosevelt set out four freedoms essential for world peace in his 1941 State of the Union address: freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.\textsuperscript{3} In his 1944 State of the Union address, President Roosevelt took another bold step, declaring that the United States had accepted a “second Bill of Rights,” including the right of every American to a decent home.\textsuperscript{4} The U.S. then led the U.N. in drafting and adopting the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, placing civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights, including the right to adequate housing, on equal footing.\textsuperscript{5} The U.S. signed the International Covenant on Economic, Social & Cultural Rights in 1977, which codifies the right to housing. Indeed, the ABA endorsed its ratification in 1979, making the human right to housing part of ABA policy for the past 34 years.\textsuperscript{6}

In responding to a U.N. report on the right to housing in the U.S., the State Department in 2010 emphasized that the U.S., has made a “political commitment to a human right related to housing in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights.”\textsuperscript{7}

\textbf{The Right to Housing Should be Progressively Realized}

Despite recognition of the human right to housing, implementation has not yet occurred. This resolution, as a whole, provides a framework for progressive realization of that right. As such, implementing the human right to housing would not require the government to immediately build a home for each person in America or to provide housing for all free of charge overnight. However, it does require more than some provision for emergency shelter, piecemeal implementation of housing affordability programs, and intermittent enforcement of non-discrimination laws, all of which exist in some form in all local U.S. communities and have failed as a whole to eliminate homelessness or poverty. It requires an affirmative commitment to progressively realize the right to fully adequate housing,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1} American Bar Association, ABA Mission and Goals (last visited Nov. 1, 2012), http://www.americanbar.org/util/about_the_aba/aba-mission-goals.html.
  \item \textsuperscript{3} Franklin D. Roosevelt, State of the Union Message to Congress (January 6, 1941).
  \item \textsuperscript{4} Franklin D. Roosevelt, State of the Union Message to Congress (January 11, 1944).
  \item \textsuperscript{5} See National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty, Simply Unacceptable: Homelessness & the Human Right to Housing in the United States 2011, 16 (2011) [hereinafter “Simply Unacceptable”].
  \item \textsuperscript{7} Interactive Dialogue following the report of the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context, A/HRC/13/20/Add 4 and A/HRC/13/20.
whether through public funding, market regulation, private enforcement, or a combination of all of the above.\footnote{Simply Unacceptable, supra note 5, at 8.}

This resolution calls on the U.S. government at all levels to more fully implement the right to housing as a legal commitment. Asserting housing as a human right will create a common goal and a clear framework to:

a. Help government agencies set priorities to implement the right to housing

b. Provide support for advocacy groups

c. Create pressure to end policies which fail to guarantee human rights

d. Allow us to focus on how to solve the problem rather than worrying about whether the U.S. government has a duty to solve the problem

**U.S. Policy Supports the Implementation of the Human Right to Housing Domestically**

Our nation was founded on the principles of the self-evident, unalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.\footnote{The Declaration of Independence, para. 1 (U.S. 1776).} Yet today, lack of shelter and affordable housing has forced members of our society to live their daily lives in ways that threaten their dignity and sense of worth as a human being as well as their health and safety, contrary to those founding principles.

On the 70th Anniversary of President Roosevelt’s “Four Freedoms” speech, in a presentation to the American Society of International Law, Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor Michael Posner stated, “there are many ways to think about what should or should not count as a human right. Perhaps the simplest and most compelling is that human rights reflect what a person needs in order to live a meaningful and dignified existence.”

Posner’s speech reflects the increasing importance the Obama Administration has placed on economic and social human rights such as the right to adequate housing. In March 2011, the U.S. acknowledged for the first time that rising homelessness implicates its human rights obligations, and made commitments to the United Nations (U.N.) Human Rights Council to “reduce homelessness,” “reinforce safeguards to protect the rights” of homeless people, and to continue efforts to ensure access to affordable housing for all.

In May 2012, the Department of Justice and U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness issued a joint report recognizing that criminalization of homelessness may not only violate our Constitution, but also the U.S.’s treaty obligations under the International Covenant on Civil & Political Rights, and the Convention Against Torture. The Administration has frequently welcomed both the international community’s input and its obligation to lead by example. The U.S. seems more willing than ever to hold itself to high international standards, and even acknowledge that it may sometimes fall short.

Moreover, the international community has increasingly taken note of America’s failure to uphold the right to housing. In 2006, the UN Human Rights Committee expressed concern about the disparate racial impact of homelessness in the U.S. and called for “adequate and adequately implemented policies, to ensure the cessation of this form of racial discrimination.” In 2008, the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination again recognized racial disparities in housing and ongoing segregation in the U.S. Since then, numerous U.N. experts, on official missions to the U.S., have addressed U.S. violations of the human right to housing and related rights.

The Legal Community has an Important Role to Play in Implementing the Human Right to Housing

Despite the nation’s commitment to human rights ideals, its practices have often fallen short. Families continue to face foreclosures, many as a result of predatory lending practices, but even as homes without families multiply, families without homes cannot access them. Many tenants pay more than 50% of their income toward rent, putting them one paycheck away from homelessness. Without a right to counsel in housing cases, renters must often choose between pushing for basic repairs or facing unjust eviction. When widespread poverty goes unattended, despite the sufficiency of a country’s resources, “respect for legal institutions will ultimately be undermined.” The legal community has a duty to provide these families with justice, yet we can only do so much in the nation’s current legal environment. In this instance, access to justice requires us to advocate for change. That advocacy comes in the form of this resolution, calling upon our government at all levels to implement the human right to housing as a necessary component of ensuring the basic human dignity of every individual.

Implementing the human right to adequate housing

In implementing the human right to adequate housing, the American Bar Association calls upon federal, state, local, tribal, and territorial governments to

(1) Implement policies promoting the human right to adequate housing for all including veterans, people with disabilities, older persons, families, single individuals, and unaccompanied youth, which, at minimum, includes:

   a. Affordability, habitability, and accessibility;

   b. Provision of security of tenure, access to services, materials, facilities, and infrastructure;

   c. Location proximate to employment, health care, schools, and other social facilities;

   d. Provision of housing in areas that do not threaten occupants’ health; and

   e. Protection of cultural identity or diversity

The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR), which oversees implementation of the ICESCR, lists seven elements required for housing to be considered adequate including legal security of tenure; availability of services, materials, facilities, and infrastructure; affordability; habitability; accessibility; location near employment options, healthcare facilities, schools, child care centers, and other social facilities; and cultural adequacy in housing design. This framework recognizes that each of these elements is interdependent with each other. A dequate housing requires more than four walls and a roof; it requires adequate community resources, supportive
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20 ABA Annual meeting, 1986 at 789.
legal and policy frameworks, effective access to justice, and a participatory and transparent democratic system to maintain all aspects of the right. It also recognizes that enjoyment of the right to housing is a standard relative to the availability of resources in a given country; here in the U.S., in what remains the wealthiest country in the world, we can and must do more.  

In 2010, there were over 10 million very low-income renters and only 4.5 million affordable rental units, 40% of which were occupied by higher-income renters. This lack of availability forced approximately 22 percent of the 36.9 million rental household in the United States to spend more than half of their income on housing. Not only is affordable housing in short supply, but affordable units are often inadequate in other ways based on the CEDCR definition. Underfunding for public housing leaves many affordable units in disrepair and lack of meaningful enforcement - including lack of access to legal counsel – has rendered housing codes ineffective, making these units uninhabitable. In urban areas, poor, minority areas have poorer access to basic services, including hospitals. In rural, impoverished areas, access to infrastructure allowing for basic water and sanitation is limited or unavailable. In suburbs and ex-urban communities, zoning restrictions have prevented construction of (and in some cases, removed) affordable housing. In all areas, the high cost of housing often forces individuals to endure these housing inadequacies, live in overcrowded spaces, and live in areas with failing schools, high crime rates, and increased exposure to environmental pollutants.  

Even where needy applicants are able to obtain housing assistance or access affordable housing, they face discrimination in the private housing market on the basis of race, disability, gender, sexual orientation, source of income, criminal background, or other status. Despite some strong de jure protections: over 27,000 complaints were registered in 2011 with housing protection agencies, and many more go unreported. Although this number has decreased slightly since 2009, more work needs to be done to ensure equal access to housing resources. This includes ensuring availability of various types of home and community based support services that enable individuals and families to live independently as long as possible. Additionally, as was seen following Hurricanes Katrina and Sandy, many traditionally marginalized groups feel a disparate impact during
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23 John Griffith, Julia Gordon & David Sanchez, Center for American Progress, It’s Time to Talk About Housing 7 (August 15, 2012).
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25 Simply Unacceptable, supra note 5, at 9, 74-79.
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29 Simply Unacceptable, supra note 5, 51-61
natural disasters, and the right to adequate housing must be ensured appropriately in the post-disaster context as well.  

The U.S. has a strong tradition of promoting affordable, accessible housing, but programs have been under-funded and under-implemented. Moreover, while the human rights framework demands progressive implementation of the right to housing, and prohibits retrogressive policies, over the past 30 years there has been a significant disinvestment in public and subsidized housing at the federal level. Recent years have seen innovations such as the Rental Assistance Demonstration and Choice Neighborhoods Initiative, which attempt to “do more with less” while preserving important rights and protections for low-income residents, but these programs still fail to meet the need in communities. Furthermore, many long-term contracts for affordable housing built under the Section 8 program during the 1960’s are now coming to term, threatening a further loss of affordable units.  

The contours of the human right to adequate housing continue to be developed at the international level by the CESCR and other U.N. experts, and at the regional level by regional human rights bodies, in response to ever-changing conditions. The U.S. should always seek to be a leader in applying these developing standards to its policies.

(2) Take immediate steps to respect, protect, and fulfill the right to adequate housing and other human rights through measures guaranteeing the availability of affordable, accessible housing to all who require it;

Progressively realizing the right to adequate housing requires resolutions, recognition, and legislation, but also requires action. In our federal system, states and local communities are often best situated to act quickly to remedy human rights violations in a way that is effective for their area. State and local governments should not wait for the United States to act on the right to adequate housing but should immediately take steps to create local solutions to housing rights violations. Recent positive steps include resolutions recognizing and pledging to implement the human right to housing in Madison and Dane County, WI, and the introduction of a homeless bill of rights referencing human rights standards in California.
Recognize that homelessness is a prima facie violation of the right to housing, and to examine the fiscal benefits of implementation of the right to housing as compared to the costly perpetuation of homelessness;

Homelessness is an ongoing and increasingly prevalent violation of the most basic essence of the human right to housing in the United States and requires an immediate remedy. In 2011, cities across the country noted an average 16% increase in the number of homeless families. From the 2009-10 school year to the 2010-11 school year, the number of homeless school children increased by 13% to over one million children. Among other factors contributing to this growth, recent studies have shown that: one out of four homeless women is homeless as a result of domestic violence; 1 in 11 released prisoners end up homeless - with a disparate impact on racial minorities and those who have been criminalized because of their homeless status; and over 1.6 million unaccompanied homeless youth are forced out of home due to physical or sexual abuse, aging out of foster care, or as a result of disagreements with parents or caretakers over sexual orientation. Temporary shelter should only be seen as an interim, emergency response to homelessness. The right to housing demands permanent housing arrangements, with whatever supports are needed to maintain stability, in as short a time as possible.

In a 2007 resolution, equally applicable today, the ABA opposed the enactment of laws criminalizing individuals for “carrying out otherwise non-criminal life-sustaining practices or acts in public spaces, such as eating, sitting, sleeping, or camping, when no alternative private spaces are available.” Instead of providing adequate alternatives, more communities are increasingly turning to these criminalization policies. Criminalization of homelessness, and homelessness itself, injures the dignity and self-worth of the individual, as well as potentially interfering with their health and safety, where individuals are forced into unsafe situations or must face the elements without shelter. Lack of proper identification or generation of a criminal record caused by homelessness may also prevent homeless persons from accessing government support or

40 Simply Unacceptable, supra note 5, at 61-73.
43 National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, Criminalizing Crisis: The Criminalization of Homelessness in U.S. Cities 9-10 (2011) (among the 188 cities reviewed between 2009 and 2011, the report identifies a 7 percent increase in prohibitions on begging or panhandling; a 7 percent increase in prohibitions on camping in particular public places; and a 10 percent increase in prohibitions on loitering in particular public places).
finding a job.\textsuperscript{44} Low-income youth facing inadequate housing conditions or lack of housing have poorer educational outcomes due to high mobility, hunger, and health problems, creating a cycle of poverty and homelessness.\textsuperscript{45}

Housing is a critical component of overall health, and homeless persons have an average life span of 42-52 years, compared to 78 years for the general population.\textsuperscript{46} Indeed, New York City has established a right to housing for those suffering from AIDS, recognizing their “acute needs for safe, clean housing to keep them healthy.”\textsuperscript{47}

In 2010, 113 attacks, 24 of which led to the death of the victim, were deemed acts of “bias motivated violence” against homeless individuals.\textsuperscript{48} The National Coalition for the Homeless documented hate crimes against homeless persons for twelve years (1999-2010) and noted that fatal attacks on homeless individuals were twice as high each year as fatal attacks on all currently protected classes combined.\textsuperscript{49} Although low-income families in affordable housing do not face the “bias motivated violence” perpetrated against those living on the streets, low-income neighborhoods tend to have higher rates of violence than other areas. Students in poor neighborhoods reported fighting in school or the presence of weapons at school twice as often as their wealthier counterparts.\textsuperscript{50}

In addition to viewing housing expenditures as obligatory, legislators must also consider the fiscal benefits of adequately meeting low-income housing needs. In a 2004 study by the Lewin Group on the costs of serving homeless individuals in nine cities across the U.S., several cities found supportive housing to be cheaper than housing homeless individuals in shelters.\textsuperscript{51} That same year, the Congressional Budget Office estimated the cost of a Section 8 Housing Certificate to be $7,028, approximately $8,000 less than the cost of an emergency shelter bed funded by HUD’s Emergency Shelter Grants program.\textsuperscript{52} A collaborative effort of service and medical providers in San Diego, Project 25, has documented a $7 million dollar savings to tax payers through reduced emergency care and jail costs by providing permanent housing to 35 homeless individuals, a 70% reduction.\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{44} Simply Unacceptable, supra note 5, at 61-73.
\textsuperscript{45} New Housing Normal; Simply Unacceptable, supra note 5, at 74-79.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid.
Scotland, France, and South Africa all show that the progressive implementation of the right to housing through legislation and case law is possible where the political will exists. Scotland’s Homeless Act of 2003 progressively expanded the right to be immediately housed and the right to long-term, supportive housing for as long as it is needed, starting with target populations, but available to all in need as of 2012. The law also includes a private right of action and requires jurisdictions to plan for development of adequate affordable housing supplies.\textsuperscript{54} France created similar legislation in 2007 in response to public pressure and a decision of the European Committee on Social Rights under the European Social Charter.\textsuperscript{55} South Africa’s constitutional right to housing protects even those squatting in informal settlements, requiring the provision of adequate alternative housing before families and individuals can be evicted.\textsuperscript{56} This law has been enforced in local communities to even require rebuilding housing that has been torn down.\textsuperscript{57} While not yet perfect, these countries are proving that progressively implementing the right to housing is both economically feasible and judicially manageable.

Further, the American Bar Association urges the federal government to lead by example through increased efforts to support and develop the right to housing domestically and at the international level. These efforts include:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{Prioritizing funding for housing when making federal budgetary decisions;}
  \item \textbf{Assessing the impact new federal legislation and regulatory decisions will have on the right to housing;}
  \item \textbf{Urging every state, locality, and territory to develop comprehensive affordable housing strategies;}
  \item \textbf{Developing mandates or incentives for housing developers and financial institutions to ensure the right to housing as a priority;}
  \item \textbf{Prohibiting state and local governments, territories, government-owned entities, and substantially government-related entities from violating the right to adequate housing;}
  \item \textbf{Requiring governments and organizations to prevent or mitigate any infringement upon the right to adequate housing;}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{57} See Tswelopele Non-Profit Organisation v. City of Tshwane metropolitan Municipality [2007] SCA 70 (RSA), stating “to be hounded unheralded from the privacy and shelter of one’s home, even in the most reduced circumstances, is a painful and humiliating indignity… Placing them on the list for emergency [housing] assistance will not attain the simultaneously constitutional and individual objectives that reconstruction of their shelters will achieve. The respondents should, jointly and severally, be ordered to reconstruct them. And, since the materials belonging to the occupiers have been destroyed, they should be replaced with materials that afford habitable shelters.”
g. Leading a shift in discussion of housing services from providing charity to supporting victims of human rights violations;

h. Reviewing policies that govern the cost of housing to ensure costs do not interfere with a person’s ability to enjoy other human rights such as the right to adequate food or health; and

i. Supporting the adoption of resolutions, treaties, and other international principles further establishing and promoting the right to housing at the international and regional level and committing to their implementation domestically.

Federal housing assistance provides several million units of housing nationwide but continues to fall far short of adequately addressing the country’s low-income housing needs. Under current funding levels, federal assistance is only available for approximately one out of every four eligible low-income families. Framing these expenditures as part of our government’s basic obligations to its citizens, the same as its duty to ensure constitutional rights, allows us to establish a new baseline in budgetary debates and planning.

To take some of the burden to support the homeless and low-income populations off the government, the government must include the right to adequate housing in its policy decisions. At the start of the economic downturn in 2007 and 2008, for example, the government provided bailout money to failing banks without requiring protections to help those facing foreclosure remain in their homes. Had protections been included, the government and banks could have worked to keep homeowners in their homes to prevent a massive influx in the number of families requiring affordable housing or homelessness services.

As a leader in the international community, the United States should be on the forefront of the realization of a right to adequate housing. This requires acknowledging housing
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58 See Simply Unacceptable, supra note 5, at 51-61.
59 Id., at 26.
60 Id., at 11.
62 Preventing foreclosure is far more cost-effective for all stakeholders: banks, individuals, and governments - than incurring losses and government having to provide additional services once a family becomes homeless. See, e.g. Diana Savino, NYS Foreclosure Prevention Services Campaign, Feb. 1, 2012, http://www.nysenate.gov/press-release/nys-foreclosure-prevention-services-program-campaign-0 (estimating $1 of investment in foreclosure prevention generates a $68 return); see also, Roberto G. Quercia, Spencer M. Cowan & Ana M. Moreno, The Cost-Effectiveness of Community-Based Foreclosure Prevention, 2005; Ana M. Moreno, Cost Effectiveness of Mortgage Foreclosure Prevention, 1995.
as a priority in terms of funding, regulation, and enforcement. This also requires a paradigm shift in our society. Provision of housing can no longer been seen as an optional government entitlement program but must be seen as an essential protection of human rights. Overall, we must realize as a country that protecting human rights is not optional and that the violation of one individual’s human rights weakens an entire community.

**Conclusion**

The U.S. is in the midst of the worst housing crisis since the Great Depression. We need a new framework in which to discuss issues of housing and homelessness; a framework that says everyone has a right to adequate housing. While adopting an explicit human rights framework in the U.S. would represent a shift, the U.S. has a proud history to which it can point, starting from the days of President Roosevelt that demonstrate the human right to housing is not a foreign, but a domestic value. Our current struggle with budget deficits is not a reason to defer actions to improve Americans’ access to adequate housing; rather, it is precisely in this time of economic crisis that the need to do so is most acute. Given that the U.S. is still the wealthiest nation in the world, with a well-developed democratic and judicial system, the ABA calls upon all levels of government to hold itself to a high standard, one that recognizes the full dignity of every human being cannot be guaranteed without enjoying, among all other rights, the human right to adequate housing.

Respectfully submitted,

Antonia Fasanelli, Chair
Commission on Homelessness & Poverty

August 2013

determines how well countries perform in meeting economic and social rights, such as the right to housing, in light of their available resources, places the U.S. 24th out of 24 high-income countries analyzed.); See The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 100 of 1996, §§ 26-28, (The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa includes the right of all to access of affordable housing.)

64 See Simply Unacceptable, supra note 5, at 93.
1. **Summary of Resolution(s).**

   This resolution calls upon local, state, tribal, and federal government to progressively implement policies promoting the human right to adequate housing for all including veterans, people with disabilities, older persons, families, single individuals, and unaccompanied youth, and urges the federal government to lead by example through increased efforts to support and develop the right to housing domestically and at the international level.

   This resolution, as a whole, provides a framework for progressive realization of that right. As such, implementing the human right to housing would not require the government to immediately build a home for each person in America or to provide housing for all free of charge overnight. However, it does require more than some provision for emergency shelter, piecemeal implementation of housing affordability programs, and intermittent enforcement of non-discrimination laws, all of which exist in some form in all local U.S. communities and have failed as a whole to eliminate homelessness or poverty. It requires an affirmative commitment to progressively realize the right to fully adequate housing, whether through public funding, market regulation, private enforcement, or a combination of all of the above.

2. **Approval by Submitting Entity.**

   The Commission approved this policy resolution on May 4, 2013.

3. **Has this or a similar resolution been submitted to the House or Board previously?**

   No. Please see response to #4 below.

4. **What existing Association policies are relevant to this Resolution and how would they be affected by its adoption?**

   In 1979, the ABA endorsed the U.S. ratification of the International Covenant on Economic, Social & Cultural Rights which codifies the right to housing. (See ABA House Report 690 MY 1979.) Adoption of this policy would build on the ABA’s 34 year history of advocacy in the human rights arena.

5. **If this is a late report, what urgency exists which requires action at this meeting of the House?**

   N/A
6. **Status of Legislation.** (If applicable)

None at this time.

7. **Brief explanation regarding plans for implementation of the policy, if adopted by the House of Delegates.**

The United States government has supported the human right to housing in a number of international treaties and other documents, and is increasingly discussing housing and homelessness in terms of human rights. Lawyers across the country are using human rights framing at the federal, state, and local levels as an additional tool in litigation and legislative advocacy to end homelessness and promote the right to adequate housing for all.

8. **Cost to the Association.** (Both direct and indirect costs)

None. Existing Commission and Governmental Affairs staff will undertake the Association’s advocacy on behalf of these recommendations, as is the case with other Association policies.

9. **Disclosure of Interest.** (If applicable)

There are no known conflicts of interest with this resolution.

10. **Referrals.**
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Litigation  
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Center for Human Rights
Commission on Disability Rights
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Summary of the Resolution

This resolution calls upon federal, state, local, territorial, and tribal governments to progressively implement policies promoting the human right to adequate housing for all including veterans, people with disabilities, older persons, families, single individuals, and unaccompanied youth, and urges the federal government to lead by example through increased efforts to support and develop the right to housing domestically and at the international level.

This resolution, as a whole, provides a framework for progressive realization of that right. As such, implementing the human right to housing would not require the government to immediately build a home for each person in America or to provide housing for all free of charge overnight. However, it does require more than some provision for emergency shelter, piecemeal implementation of housing affordability programs, and intermittent enforcement of non-discrimination laws, all of which exist in some form in all local U.S. communities and have failed as a whole to eliminate homelessness or poverty. It requires an affirmative commitment to progressively realize the right to fully adequate housing, whether through public funding, market regulation, private enforcement, or a combination of all of the above.

2. Summary of the Issue that the Resolution Addresses

Despite the nation’s commitment to human rights ideals, its practices have often fallen short. The U.S. has a strong tradition of promoting affordable, accessible housing, but programs have been under-funded and under-implemented. Furthermore, over the past 30 years there has been a significant disinvestment in public and subsidized housing at the federal level. Families continue to face foreclosures, many as a result of predatory lending practices, but even as homes without families multiply, families without homes cannot access them. Many tenants pay more than 50% of their income toward rent, putting them one paycheck away from homelessness. Homelessness is an ongoing and increasingly prevalent violation of the most basic essence of the human right to housing in the United States and requires an immediate remedy. In 2011, cities across the country noted an average 16% increase in the number of homeless families. From the 2009-10 school year to the 2010-11 school year, the number of homeless school children increased by 13% to over one million children.

3. Please Explain How the Proposed Policy Position will address the issue

This resolution calls on the U.S. government at all levels to more fully implement the right to housing as a legal commitment. Asserting housing as a human right will create a common goal and a clear framework to:
a. Help government agencies set priorities to implement the right to housing
b. Provide support for advocacy groups
c. Create pressure to end policies which fail to guarantee human rights
d. Allow us to focus on how to solve the problem rather than worrying about whether the U.S. government has a duty to solve the problem

4. Summary of Minority Views

None to date.